

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 and 5-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3 and 5-25 stand rejected. Reconsideration and further examination of the subject patent application in light of the present Amendment and Remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, and 5-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 5,734,837 to Flores et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,606,740 to Lynn et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended for clarification. Independent claims 1, 14 and 20 are limited to “real-time events.” Real-time workflows for events or the real-time data defining real-time events are discussed throughout the specification (e.g., page 7, lines 2-3; page 10, lines 10-11, etc.).

Claims 1-3, and 5-25 are clearly differentiated over Flores et al. and Lynn et al. For example, rather than being directed to real-time events, Flores et al. and Lynn et al. are directed to business processes. In this regard, Flores et al. states that the Flores “invention is a method and system which is used to . . . generate business process definitions and generate workflow-enabled applications . . . A singled workflow is shown in FIGS. 1a-1f as an elliptical loop . . . wherein each quadrant . . . signifies different phases of the workflow. The first phase is called the preparation phase . . . The second phase is called the negotiation phase . . . The third phase is called the performance phase . . . The last phase is called the acceptance phase during which the customer determines whether or not the conditions of satisfaction have been met” (Flores et al.,

paragraph bridging columns 3-4). Similarly, the Lynn et al. “BLCaseWorkList 62 retrieves a prioritized worklist for a user when a worker starts a session with a workflow processing system according to the present invention” (Lynn et al., col. 7, lines 56-58). Clearly Flores et al. and Lynn et al. are not directed to the processing of real-time events.

Moreover, Flores et al. is simply concerned with initial creation of workflow applications and does not disclose defining a new event structure or creating a new workflow for the new event source without modifying the preconfigured workflow engine, or creating a conditional event rule that returns a result to the event source via a callback. The Office Action cites Fig. 2a, items 13 and 15, Fig. 3, item 43, Col. 3, lines 62 — Col. 4, line 9, and Col. 8, lines 7-30 as disclosing the workflow configured to return a result to the event source via a callback to enable correction of data structure in response to a failure as claimed. However, none of the cited figures or passages discloses anything that is even remotely related to the claimed features. Fig. 2a merely shows a business process map showing one of two conditional workflows 13, 15 initiated by conditional link 17; Fig. 3 merely illustrates that item 43 is an event handler; Col. 3-4 merely describes the four phases of Flores type workflow; and Col. 8, lines 7-30 describes business process maps. There is no mention of the real-time workflow returning a result to the event source, use of callback, or correction of data structures in response to a failure.

The Office Action also asserts that Flores discloses defining a new event structure at Col. 4, lines 48-64, and in Fig. 6, ref. 51. However, Col. 4, lines 48-64 merely describe a workflow server but does not describe adding a new event source to a preconfigured workflow engine database or defining a new event structure for the new source. The Office Action further asserts that Flores discloses the claimed creating of at least one executable function at Col. 5, lines 11-14, and Col. 7, lines 63 Col. 8, line 6. However, Col. 5 describes an agent manager which

executes workflows but does not describe creating a new data structure for the new event or matching the events with workflows, as claimed. Col. 7, lines 63 to Col. 8, line 6, describes a GUI where the user may delete a workflow, and a scripting language for generation of workflows but does not describe creating new data structures for new event sources or matching the events to workflow as claimed.

The Office action concedes that Flores does not disclose the creating the workflow without modifying the workflow server engine but asserts that Lynn does at Col. 11, lines 55-57 and at Col. 28, lines 30-37. Lynn describes a workflow processing framework that provides common objects. However, Col. 11, lines 55-57 merely describe a basic interface control for Index, Document Retrieval, and Case Retrieval interfaces which can be modified without changing the rest of the application. This is not a disclosure of the claimed adding a new event source structure and workflow without changing the workflow server engine. More specifically, Lynn et al. explicitly states that “graphical user interfaces (GUIs) . . . are included in a work-flow processing system according to the present invention . . . Examples are Index, . . . Case Retrieval, and Document Retrieval interfaces” (Lynn et al., col. 10, lines 3-9). As such, Lynn et al. is merely directed to avoiding the recompiling of GUIs.

Moreover, there is no discussion of a workflow engine in col. 11, lines 55-57 or discussion of a new event structure. Col. 11, lines 55-57 merely discusses changing an application interface without changing the rest of the same application. The claim calls for defining new event structures and creating associated workflows without modifying the preconfigured workflow server engine. Col. 28, lines 30-37 merely concerns claiming that certain software objects supporting business function are not changed when work steps are defined by the user. There is no mention of new event sources, a new event structure, a plurality

of event parameters associated with the new structure, or of the workflow engine not being changed when the new event source and event structure are added. The work steps and document retrieval application mentioned in Lynn are not new real-time event structures and do not teach avoiding changing a preconfigured workflow engine as claimed. Thus, these features are not taught or suggested by Flores or Lynn. Thus, independent claims 1, 14, and 20 are believed to be distinguishable over the references as are dependent claims 2-13, 15-19, and 21-25.

Regarding claim 3, the Office Action asserts that Flores at Col. 12, lines 64-67 and Col. 15, lines 25-30 describes the claimed associating the workflow with the event id. However, the Col. 12 passage merely mentions the word "identities" which in Col. 13, lines 6-7 is described as specific personal information, not an event id; and the Col. 15 passage states an identifier variable used in a workflow short name is a single word but does not mention an event id or its claimed use.

Regarding claim 6, the Office Action cites Flores at Col. 5, lines 59-62 as disclosing a dynamical link library as the executable function. However, Flores at Col. 5 merely describes API definitions from a library used to generate workflow definition structures in the definition database, not a DLL which builds an event message and sends events to the workflow engine, as claimed. Thus, these features are also not disclosed and claims 3, 6, and 14 are further distinguishable over the cited references.

Further, claim 10 calls for preventing changes to the workflow databases when the workflow is in use, and claim 13 requires maintaining a sorted list of rule sets, and searching the sorted list in order upon receiving a workflow event. These features are also not disclosed by Flores or Lynn, however, the Office Action asserts that these features are disclosed by Du Fig. 9 at col. 2, lines 32-49; and col. 9, lines 44 to col. 10, line 4. However, Du, at col. 2, and 9-10

merely describes a system for allowing consistent workflow process which locks data specified for future access by the workflow process from being accessed before the workflow process is commenced. This does not teach or prevent locking data from being changed during use by the workflow engines. Regarding claim 13, Du at Cols. 6-7 merely describes a workflow engine, HP Open PM, which steps through a workflow, the queue manager 67 of Fig. 4 is not described and maintenance of a sorted list of currently loaded event to workflow rules sets, and a search of such a list is not described. Thus, claims 10 and 13 are believed to be further distinguishable over the cited references.

#### Closing Remarks

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the subject application is in condition for allowance and earnestly solicits an early Notice of Allowance. Should the Primary Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Primary Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the

Appl. No. 10/737,266

unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. *(If filed by paper, a duplicate copy of this sheet(s) is enclosed).*

Respectfully submitted,

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS  
WELSH & KATZ

By: 

Jon P. Christensen  
Registration No. 34,137

Dated: January 26, 2010

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS  
WELSH & KATZ  
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 2200  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 655-1500